REMARKS

After entry of the above amendments, claims 42-68 will be pending in the present application. Claims 1-41 have been cancelled. New claims 42-68 have been added. Support for the new claims can be found, for instance, on pages 4-8 of the specification. Applicant reserves the right to pursue any of the cancelled claims in a continuation application. No new matter has been added.

Previously pending claims 1-41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,898,577 to Johnson, in view of U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2002/0083332 to Grawrock, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,725,382 to Thompson et al. Applicant respectfully submits that new claims 42-68 are patentable over Johnson, in view of Grawrock, and further in view of Thompson.

New claim 42 recites "storing the private key assigned to the remote user in a key chain of a provided security chip, wherein the key chain is formed by wrapping the private key assigned to the remote user using at least one key pair assigned to the computer network and wrapping the at least one key pair assigned to the computer network using an encryption key assigned to the provided security chip." Applicant respectfully submits that none of the cited references discloses, teaches, or suggests the claim element.

Johnson is directed to "methods and systems that allow a single sign-on authentication of customers in a multi-vendor e-commerce environment and to methods and systems for directory authentication of electronic bank drafts" (col. 1, lns. 14-17 of Johnson). Although Johnson discusses encrypting a customer's ID and password using a first encryption scheme, such as a

public key, decrypting the customer's ID and password, then re-encrypting the customer's password using a second encryption scheme, which may be another public key, it does not disclose how the key(s) used for encryption are stored (*see, e.g.*, col. 6, lns. 15-53 of Johnson). In fact, Johnson does not even mention security chips or key chains.

Grawrock is directed to "a platform and method for generating and distributing a secret value between multiple devices" (pg. 1, para. 0013 of Grawrock). Although Grawrock discusses the generation of a secret value, which may be used as a cryptographic key, it does not disclose how the secret value is stored (*see, e.g.*, pg. 3, para. 0039-0041 of Grawrock).

Thompson is directed to "security mechanisms for thwarting theft of or unauthorized access of devices, and particularly to password mechanisms" (col. 1, lns. 6-8 of Thompson). Although Thompson discusses storing an encryption key in a BIOS device, it does not disclose storing the encryption key in "a key chain of a provided security chip," as recited in claim 42 (*see, e.g.*, col. 6, lns. 21-52 of Thompson).

Accordingly, based at least on the reasons above, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 42, and the claims that depend therefrom, are patentable over Johnson, in view of Grawrock, and further in view of Thompson. Since claims 51 and 60 recite elements similar to those of claim 42, it is respectfully submitted that those claims, and the claims that depend therefrom, are patentable over Johnson, in view of Grawrock, and further in view of Thompson for at least the same reasons.

CONCLUSION

On the basis of the above remarks, reconsideration and allowance of the claims is believed to be warranted and such action is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions or comments, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,
SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP

Dated: May 24, 2006

Erin C. Ming
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 47,797
(650) 475-1449